

**Remarks**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of this Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**Claims 1-26 are Allowable over the Proposed *Levine-Abjanic* Combination.**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,745,681 to Levine et al. ("Levine") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0205597 A1 to Abjanic ("Abjanic"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

*Levine* discloses a stateless Internet shopping cart. *Column 1, Lines 7-14*. The Internet shopping cart disclosed in *Levine* operates on a server, but the server does not maintain a list of selected items for the shopping cart. *Column 1, Lines 50-58*. Rather, each time the client interacts with the server, the server updates a data field that identifies the contents of the cart and then sends the updated data field back to the client. The Internet shopping cart disclosed in *Levine* does not relate in any way to the creation of end-user orders for communications services.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Levine* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element recited independent Claim 1. At a minimum, *Levine* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the recited end-user ordering module of Claim 1 that is operable to:

- determine whether an end-user requested service item contained in a service provider product catalog relates to a service item type having at least one associated developer defined label (DDL), the DDL extending the attributes of the associated service item type by specifying an additional attribute for which a value may be collected from the end-user and supplied in connection with creation of an end-user order for the requested service item, the value not needed to complete the end-user order but collected and supplied to avoid needing to collect the value from the end-user in connection with subsequent creation of an inter-provider order that corresponds to the end-user order;
- if the requested service item relates to a service item type having at least one DDL, prompt a user of the end-

user ordering module to collect from the end-user and supply a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute in connection with creation of the end-user order for the requested service item; and

- communicate the end-user order for use in subsequently creating the corresponding inter-provider order

The Examiner cites to Columns 1-2 and Figures 3-4 of *Levine* as allegedly disclosing these limitations. However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Levine* fails to disclose any of these limitations. In fact, *Levine* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a “developer defined label (DDL),” a DDL specified “attribute,” or even an “interprovider order” that corresponds to an “end-user order,” as recited in independent Claim 1. Moreover, the Examiner has not identified anything in *Levine* that could properly be construed as a “developer defined label (DDL)” or an “interprovider order,” as recited in independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Furthermore, *Levine* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an inter-provider ordering module operable to “determine whether the end-user order has a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute,” as recited in independent Claim 1. The Examiner cites to the Abstract, Columns 5-6, and Figures 2e-2g of *Levine* as allegedly disclosing these limitations. However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Levine* fails to disclose any of these limitations. In fact, as discussed above, *Levine* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest even a “DDL” or a “DDL-specified attribute,” as recited in independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 1 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Additionally, *Levine* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the recited inter-provider ordering module of Claim 1 that is operable to:

- if the end-user order has a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute, automatically map the value from the end-user order to an appropriate field of the inter-provider order such that the value need not be collected from the end-user in connection with creation of the inter-provider order.

The Examiner acknowledges that *Levine* fails to disclose this limitation and cites to Paragraphs 0024 and 0026 of *Abjanic* as allegedly disclosing this limitation. *Office Action*,

*Page 4.* The Examiner states, “[*Abjanic*] discloses automatically and electronically detect that inventory has decreased below a threshold value and then automatically generate and send a purchase order to a supplier’s server at a data center to request a shipment of additional supplier’s inventory.” *Id.*

Applicants respectfully submit that detecting inventory levels and generating a purchase order for additional inventory cannot properly be construed as automatically mapping a value for an additional DDL-specified attribute “from the end-user order to an appropriate field of the inter-provider order,” as recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, the Examiner has not identified any element disclosed in *Abjanic* that could properly be construed as “an end-user order,” “an inter-provider order,” or “a value of the additional DDL-specified attribute,” as recited in independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 1 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Independent Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons and independent Claims 8, 15, and 22-26 are allowable for at least certain similar reasons. Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are allowable at least based on their dependence on independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 shown above to be allowable. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-26.

#### **No Waiver**

All of Applicants’ arguments are without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants do not waive other arguments not presented in this response. For example, Applicants reserve the right to argue that *Levine* and *Abjanic* are not analogous art and that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art to combine *Levine* and *Abjanic* as proposed by the Examiner. Additionally, by not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner’s additional statements.

**Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Christopher W. Kennerly, Attorney for Applicants at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6812.

Applicants believe that no fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Christopher W. Kennerly  
Reg. No. 40,675

Dated: 1/4/07

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, 6th Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6812

Customer Number:

**05073**